## RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS

STEPHENE HALE
MELVINC HALL
SMARGHE HAMMI
ZACHERY R HARGIS
CHRISTOHICA E HEROTI
JERRIL HALL
HOLLY M HILLERIANN
ERIK S HOLLOWION
ROBERTE HOWARD
WAN GREGORY JAMES
STEVEN JAMESZEWEN
HELDOMIN JOHES
SARAH G KENY
SCOTT P HARLL
FRINT OPHER E KOPSEL
TERRY D KORDELISH I
O DIMALLER
MICHELED LEFLORE
JOSEPHP LEMART
TYLER D LEONARD
C S LEWIS III
ADRIAN LOPEZ KUPPER
LOPIN LOPOZINEVES
DIMI LOPOZINEVES
BREIGAN J MACEE
MINET G MALLON
JOHN ROSS MALON
MAIT O MATHESON

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW THE PARAGON BUILDING SUITE 101 5801 BROADWAY EXTENSION OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73118-7489 (405) 843-9909 Fax (405) 842-2913

September 7, 2007

GLOVE L MCCOY
RAYLINIDA MELTON
RAYLINIDA MILDREN
DUGARI NOMAKEDHAI
DI LYON MOREHEAD
JI YON MOREHEAD
JI YON MOREHEAD
JI YON MOREHEAD
JANICE LOGAN MORROY
ROBERT A RANCE
GARY I. NEAL
LARRI L. NELMS
HARCARGET A RUNNERY
SHAWII C OBUCKLEY
JAMES C ORBIGSIN
NICOLE J PETTY
WHITEY D PETTY
JAMES R POLAN
RICHARD PEOGRMON
DAVID L. PRICE
VICTORIAL RACHELY
FRED RAYLL. JR
LISAR RIGOS
STEPHEN B GROUE
STEPHEN B GROUE
RAYLININGS
MORYID RIGOS
STEPHEN B GRUE
RAYLININGS
MORYID RIGOS
MORYID

KENNETH M. SMITH
SCOTT O SMITH
BETTY J. SOMMARS
BEVERLY A STEWART
CHRISTOPHER B. SWAMON
STEPHANE I. THEBAN
DAVID H. HOMAS
B. MICHAEL C. THEBAN
MICHAEL C. TURPEN
LINDA VAHARKE-GREUEL
KAMER CANDEN WEAVER
JOSEPHA WELLS
BRIAN S WILKERSON
DOUGLAS A VALSON
JERRY L. WITH
MICHAEL C. WOOLD
KENNETH L. WITH
MICHAEL C. WOOLD
KAN WOOLD
K

Ol Counsel Benjamin P. Apney E. Dryan Hamson Peter J. Regan

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ms Theresa Noble Hill, Esq Rhodes, Hieronymus, Jones, Tucker & Gable, PLLC 100 W. 5th St., Suite 400 Tulsa, OK 74103-4287

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson, et al. U.S. District Court for the Northern District of

Oklahoma Case No. 05-CV-00329-GKF-SAJ

Dear Theresa:

We have received your letter of August 27, 2007 in which you express your reluctance to consolidate your proposed Rule 30(b)(6) depositions of the State with the other Defendants in order to save time and expense for the State, and, for that matter, the Defendants. Your principal reason is that you intend to ask questions specific to the Cargill Defendants, and that no economies could be achieved by consolidating the deposition with those of other Defendants who would presumably want to ask similarly defendant specific questions.

We disagree with your reasoning. Many of the "Cargill specific" areas of inquiry you propose for the State will receive similar answers based upon the nature of the State's case. This process has been previewed in the extensive and overlapping written discovery to which the State has already responded. We urge you to reconsider your position and to join us in approaching the other Defendants in order to consolidate these depositions on reasonable terms which economically meet the needs of all of the parties.

We make this proposal without waiving any objections to or relief from the Rule 30(b)(6) notices which the Cargill Defendants have served upon the State.

Please advise if your clients are willing to reconsider your position and join us in formulating a reasonable and economical approach which will not result in serial deposition of the State's witnesses.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Nance FOR THE FIRM